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Homosexuality in Your Child’s School

BY PETER SPRIGG

Despite decades of activism and media propaganda promoting acceptance and celebration of homosexuality, and numerous political and judicial victories for the pro-homosexual movement, a clear majority of Americans still believe that homosexual behavior is “morally wrong.” Indoctrinating impressionable school children is an easier way of changing public attitudes toward homosexuality than persuading adults. However, since directly promoting acceptance of homosexuality or of sexual activity by students would be controversial, pro-homosexual activists routinely deny or downplay those aspects of their agenda. Instead, they begin with the school policy proposals that are likely, politically, to win the most agreement. The first issue raised by the advocates of homosexuality is invariably the same—“safety.”

“Safe Schools”

Pro-homosexual activists contend that our schools have large numbers of students who are (or are perceived to be) “gay,” lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered, (“GLBT” or “LGBT” for short) and
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that such students are frequent victims of verbal or physical harassment or even acts of violence. The Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), for example, reports that 90% of the “LGBT” youth they surveyed in 2005 have experienced at least verbal harassment at school (albeit not always for their sexual orientation). They also point to reports that gay youths are more likely to commit suicide than their straight peers, and claim that this is a result of harassment and discrimination as well. They argue, therefore, that “LGBT” youth should be singled out for specific protection under school disciplinary codes.

Yet there is evidence that harassment of “gay” teens may neither be as frequent, as severe, nor as disproportionate, as some pro-homosexual rhetoric would suggest. GLSEN fails to note, for example, that a survey by the American Association of University Women (AAUW) showed that 83% of all girls and 79% of all boys report experiencing physical intimidation or sexual harassment at school. Even GLSEN’s survey reported that students are more often bullied, called names, or harassed because of “the way they look or their body size” than because of their sexual orientation. Of the “gay” teens surveyed by GLSEN, 79% reported that they had not “been called names, teased, bullied, or hurt at school” in the past year because of their sexual orientation, while 92% had never experienced “physical assault” for that reason.

Reports of “gay” teen suicides also appear to have been exaggerated. One study by a pro-homosexual researcher found, “Gay and lesbian teenagers are only slightly more likely than heterosexual kids to attempt suicide,” according to USA Today. And the author of Suicide in America, Dr. Herbert Hendin, reportedly “found no evidence that social discrimination was a major factor behind the suicide attempts of the homosexual students he studied.”

No student should ever be the victim of unprovoked violence or be subjected to taunting or the use of vulgar epithets—whether for their sexual orientation or for any other reason. But if all forms of harassment are wrong, then all forms of harassment—without distinction—should be banned.

“Anti-Discrimination” Codes

Pro-homosexual activists also promote policies that forbid “discrimination” against students or teachers on the basis of “sexual orientation.”

However, singling out “sexual orientation” for special protection (along with the usual categories of “race, color, national origin, sex, and disability”) is illogical. The latter qualities are usually inborn, involuntary, immutable, and innocuous—none of which is true of homosexual behavior, despite the claims of its advocates.

Nevertheless, pro-homosexual activists believe that homosexuals should be permitted not only to teach, but to proclaim their sexual preference openly. One California school district adopted a policy to “in-
sure that gay youth and staff can come out” and that “teachers can provide positive images of gay people in the classroom . . .”\textsuperscript{11}

One of the poster children for “anti-discrimination” policies is Wendy Weaver, a homosexual teacher from Salem, Utah. She was fired from her position as a school volleyball coach after admitting her lesbianism, but later won reinstatement.\textsuperscript{12} Apparently, the thought that some of the teenage girls on the volleyball team might feel uncomfortable about sharing the locker room with an adult coach who could see them as objects of sexual attraction did not carry sufficient weight.

The supposed “right” of teachers to be “out” about their sexual orientation even extends to “transgendered” staff—and costs taxpayer money—as well. Eastchester High School in New York was treated to the spectacle of a male teacher taking a year off—with pay—for sex-change surgery, and then returning to the same school to teach as a “woman,” going by the name RandeyMichelle Gordon. (Gordon later went on leave again—supported by state disability benefits).\textsuperscript{13} Lily McBeth, a 71-year-old man who recently became a “woman,” was similarly re-hired as a substitute teacher—by a New Jersey elementary school. One mother said “she thought McBeth would confuse her sons because McBeth had already taught them when she was male”—but such concerns were discounted by the school board.\textsuperscript{14}

Teacher Training

Activists also lobby for opportunities to present pro-homosexual propaganda to teachers and administrators through mandatory training sessions.

Exploring the GLSEN website, however, one finds the principal evils they seek to overcome are not harassment or violence, but “homophobia” and “heterosexism.” “Homophobia” is a term that stigmatizes those with traditional values by implying that they (not homosexuals) are the ones with a mental illness (even though recent research has concluded that “homophobia” in this clinical sense actually does not exist.\textsuperscript{15})

“Heterosexism”—the belief “that heterosexuality and a binary gender structure are the norm”—is now classified with “ideological systems that deny, denigrate, and stigmatize people”\textsuperscript{16} as something to be “undone.”

The outline that represents GLSEN’s “basic approach” to school staff training indicates that nothing less than complete “support” for homosexuality is the goal (the outline includes a specific scale of attitudes and makes clear that “tolerance” and “acceptance” are unacceptably weak stances to adopt).\textsuperscript{17} Its goal is not just to keep homosexual students “safe,” but “to elevate the status of LGBT students from a protected class to a valued group” by actively affirming homosexuality, because for GLSEN, “The pursuit of safety and affirmation are one and the same goal . . .”\textsuperscript{18}
“Gay-Straight Alliances”

A more important task for pro-homosexual activists—indoctrinating the children themselves—usually begins with formation of a student club called a “gay-straight alliance” (GSA). GSA’s are often said to promote “safety” and give gay, “questioning,” and “straight ally” youth a forum to “discuss sexual orientation and gender identity issues.”

However—as with other pro-homosexual school policies—GSA’s often take on roles that go far beyond insuring safety and a place to talk. For example, GLSEN’s article on “20 Ways Your GSA Can Rock the World!” includes: getting pro-homosexual books in the school library; protesting examples of “heterosexism” (such as “gender specific” bathrooms); participating in gay “pride” marches; and “outreach to middle schools.” The Massachusetts Department of Education has even given taxpayer money to GSA’s to subsidize pro-gay political activism and social events.

Some are concerned that GSA’s will encourage young people who are unsure of themselves to experiment sexually or to prematurely identify themselves as homosexual or bisexual. The Boston Globe, for instance, reported on a high school junior named Rachel, who says she had some questions about her sexuality when she joined [her] school’s gay-straight alliance . . . A crush on a girlfriend made Rachel “more and more sure I wasn’t completely straight.” Now Rachel, who has a boyfriend, considers herself bisexual. “ . . . I don’t think I would have been as comfortable if I hadn’t been in the GSA,” she said.

Student Indoctrination: Special Events

To raise an entire new generation of young people who will have an unquestioning acceptance of pro-homosexual dogma, however, requires activities that will reach the entire student body.

These usually begin with special assemblies or one-day or one-time events. For example, when a school in Massachusetts celebrated “To B GLAD Day,” parents were not told that it stood for “Transgender, Bisexual, Gay and Lesbian Day,” and would feature workshops about “Life Outside the Gender Norm,” “Being Gay in the Professional World,” and “fighting homophobia.”

GLSEN annually promotes a one-day event they call the “Day of Silence, which they describe as a day when defenders of homosexuality “take a day-long vow of silence to . . . protest . . . discrimination and harassment.” This disruption of the educational process, whereby students who are normally called upon in class refuse to speak and, in some cases, even teachers themselves refuse to give their normal lectures, has been questioned in some school districts, but tolerated in others.

Another approach has been to ride the coattails of “multiculturalism” by including “LGBT History Month” among other “celebrations of culture and
heritage.” Pro-homosexual activists in schools trumpet their claims that “there are countless . . . artists, philosophers, inventors, even world leaders” who were gay. (One pair of gay activists has pointed out: “Famous historical figures are . . . in no position to deny [their homosexuality] and sue for libel.”)

In North Carolina, parents were shocked to learn that the North Carolina Governor’s School, an elite state-funded summer program attended by their son, had featured a seminar on “The New Gay Teenager” that encouraged students to question their own sexuality and biblical teaching against homosexuality. One of the leaders of the seminar, Susan Wiseman (a 27-year-old high school teacher and lesbian) was later suspended without pay after being accused of sexual misconduct with a 17-year-old student at her school.

Perhaps the most notorious one-day event was GLSEN’s annual conference in Massachusetts in 2000—now commonly known as the “Fistgate” conference. This event, attended by young people at least as young as 14, made it clear that the homosexual agenda in schools is about sex, not just “safety.” Margot E. Abels, a state employee, opened one workshop by saying, “We think that sex is cen-}

tral to every single one of us and particularly queer youth.”

In another seminar (described as “for youth only”) Abels described the sadomasochistic homosexual practice known as “fisting,” saying,

Fisting often gets a bad rap. It usually isn’t about the pain, not that we’re putting that down . . . [It’s] to put you into an exploratory mode.

Astonishingly, the lessons of the “Fistgate” scandal seem to have been quickly forgotten. In 2005, GLSEN rented space in Brookline (Mass.) High School for a Saturday conference open to students as young as middle school. Among the materials distributed was a pamphlet, titled Little Black Book V 2.0 Queer in the 21st Century. It included a section on the STD risks of eight different sex acts described in the crudest detail. When the presence of the pamphlet was first reported, Sean Haley of GLSEN declared, “The allegations are simply lies. . . No such material . . . [was] ever present.” But a day later, Fenway Community Health admitted that they had “accidentally” left copies of the pamphlet on their display table.

Less graphic, but perhaps even more startling, are the scattered reports of schools actually promoting special days for students to cross-dress (that is, for boys to dress like girls and girls to dress like boys). Such events, for instance, have been scheduled in Spurger, Texas, in a middle school in Bedford, Massachusetts, and in an elementary school in Carrier Mills, Illinois. Protests led to cancellation of the first two events. Although school staff may claim this is just “something silly for the kids to do,” Peter LaBarbera of the Illinois Family Institute pointed out that “the last thing we need is for schools to promote more confusion about the sexes and gender roles.”
Student Indoctrination: In Every Classroom

The truly breathtaking sweep of the gay education agenda is described by GLSEN:

Educators need to integrate LGBT issues throughout the curriculum—not just in classes such as health education, but in disciplines such as English, History, Art and Science.38

Pro-homosexual activists also try to fill school libraries and required reading lists with books that not only present homosexuals in a positive light, but describe homosexual acts being committed by young people in explicit terms.

One such book, assigned to a high school class in Massachusetts, is written from the perspective of a teenager, who describes “his friend’s first homosexual experience, a kid who got so drunk that he had sex with a dog, and a girl and boy who have sex on a golf course.”39

Another book, recommended by California’s “Gay-Straight Alliance Network,” features a section on “positive first sexual experiences” by “lesbian and gay young people;” but the encounters described—including one-night stands—would hardly constitute “positive . . . sexual experiences” in the minds of most American parents.40

Unfortunately, It’s Elementary Too

Perhaps the most shocking aspect of this activist assault on our schools is that they are determined to bring their pro-homosexual propaganda to the children even in the lowest grades—beginning in kindergarten.

This agenda is depicted clearly—and slickly—in a film for adults called It’s Elementary: Talking About Gay Issues in School. It features a schoolwide “Lesbian and Gay Pride Day,” as well as a “Gay Pride Assembly.” It highlights the achievements of purported homosexuals “from Michelangelo to Melissa Etheridge”41—“leading the young students,” as one critic said, “to the false assumption that being gay can’t be bad because of the good things gay people have done.”42

Chasnoff has since produced another film, That’s a Family, which encourages schools “to be inclusive of all kinds of families” (such as “gay and lesbian-headed households”).43 This film is presented as protecting the self-esteem of students whose adult caretakers have non-traditional lifestyles. (Of course, similar respect should be granted to children whose parents are alcoholics, drug dealers, or criminals—but it’s not necessary to be affirming of the choices made by the adults in their lives.)

Pro-homosexual activists in elementary schools are also using a theatre presentation and book called Cootie Shots.44 While such activists usually express great sensitivity to the harm done by insulting or violent words, they apparently aren't bothered by songs like “In Mommy's High Heels,” which includes a cross-dressing boy singing:

. . . [L]et them jump and jeer and whirl
They are the swine, I am the pearl. . . .45
Let them laugh, let them scream,
They’ll all be beheaded when I’m queen.”46
As with older youth, the pro-homosexual message is also pushed in a burgeoning crop of books directed at children, ranging literally from A (Amy Asks a Question: Grandma, What’s a Lesbian?) to Z (Zack’s Story: Growing up with same-sex parents).47

Same-Sex “Marriage” and the Schools

The impact of same-sex “marriage,” legalized in Massachusetts in 2004 by a court order, has reached the public schools as well. In September 2004, National Public Radio featured an interview with Deb Allen, a lesbian who teaches eighth-grade sex education in Brookline, Mass. Her lessons include descriptions of homosexual sex, given “thoroughly and explicitly with a chart.” Allen reports she will ask her students, “Can a woman and a woman have vaginal intercourse, and they will all say no. And I’ll say, ‘Hold it. Of course, they can. They can use a sex toy.’” If challenged, Allen says, she will respond, “Give me a break. It’s legal now.”48

Pro-Homosexual “Discrimination”

While pro-homosexual activists are usually the first to complain about alleged instances of “discrimination,” the truth is that in many cases, it is people who hold more traditional views about homosexuality who become victims of discrimination. For example:

• Debra Loveless of St. Louis was removed by a security guard from a pro-homosexual assembly at her daughter’s school.49

• A Christian student club at Pioneer High School in Ann Arbor, Michigan was excluded from a panel discussion on “Religion and Homosexuality,” and a club member’s speech to an assembly on “what diversity means to me” was censored, during the school’s “Diversity Week.”50

• In a similar case, school officials at Viroqua High School in Viroqua, Wisconsin chose to cancel a scheduled “Diversity Day” rather than allow the viewpoints of Christians and former homosexuals to be included.51

• In the state of Washington, student Lucas Schrader was denied re-enrollment in a public charter school that he had attended for three years. The reason? His father had “expressed concerns about the wisdom of having a homosexual teacher assigned to teach sex education to sixth graders.”52

• The parents of a kindergarten student in Lexington, Massachusetts were upset when their son came home from school with a book featuring same-sex couples. When David Parker, the child’s father, met with the principal to demand assurances that the school would notify him and allow his child to opt out of discussions of homosexuality in the classroom (as required by state law),53 he was instead arrested for trespassing and spent a night in jail—“stripped of my shoes, my belt, my wedding ring, and my
parental rights,” as he later put it. Six months later, the criminal charges against Parker were dropped—but the superintendent continued to bar Parker from all school property.

- Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of discrimination in favor of homosexuality in schools is New York City’s creation in 2003 of Harvey Milk High School, a deluxe public school specifically “to meet the needs of [GLBT] and questioning youth.” Any notion that Harvey Milk High was boosting the life skills of its students was seriously damaged by the arrest of five “transgendered” students—boys who posed as female prostitutes, then pretended to be undercover police officers in order to extort money from their customers.

What Can Be Done?

We have seen how an agenda that enters the schools supposedly on the basis of keeping children safe is used in fact to promote the celebration of homosexual behavior and the silencing of any opposition. Is there any way that this relentless onslaught can be stopped?

First, it is important not to lose hope. Although the incidents described in this publication have occurred in all parts of the country and even in conservative communities, the pro-homosexual agenda has by no means been implemented in every school or district. A survey taken by the pro-homosexual group Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG) in 2004 found even the most common pro-homosexual policy in schools—a harassment/non-discrimination policy that includes “gay, lesbian or bisexual students”—in only 41% of the schools surveyed. The most extreme policy advocated by PFLAG—school counseling services offering “transgender resources” to help boys become girls and vice versa—was present in only 1% of schools.

Parents Speaking Out

Just having the courage to speak out can make a difference. Parents Michael and Tonya Hartsell of Wilmington, North Carolina were shocked when their daughter Olivia—a first-grader—brought home from her school library the book *King and King*. It tells the story of a prince in need of a mate who rejects dozens of princesses before finally choosing to “marry” another prince. After a week of national media attention, Freeman Elementary School agreed to place the book under lock and key and make it available only to teachers and parents.

Some pro-family groups have now begun using special pro-homosexual events as an opportunity to share a dissenting view and truthful information about homosexuality. Several years ago, Mission America, a pro-family group based in Ohio, began
responding to GLSEN’s “Day of Silence,” taking advantage of the “silence” of normally outspoken pro-homosexual activists by declaring the same day a “Truth Without Interruption Day.” More recently, the Alliance Defense Fund, a pro-family legal advocacy group, has adapted this idea by declaring the day after the “Day of Silence” to be a “Day of Truth” (information is available at www.dayoftruth.org).

Opposing “Gay-Straight Alliances”

Because they realize that it is often the first wedge to insert a pro-homosexual agenda in their schools, many parents and other citizens have tried to block the formation of “gay-straight alliances.” However, pro-homosexual activists have sometimes defended their right to form such groups by claiming rights under the Equal Access Act—a federal law that was, ironically, designed primarily to secure the rights of students to form Christian clubs at public schools. The Equal Access Act makes it unlawful for schools to bar student groups from meeting “on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech at such meetings.”

However, if a club that affirms homosexuality is allowed, then students who oppose homosexuality have the same “equal access” rights. At Eisenhower High School in Lawton, Oklahoma, one parent concerned about the push for a GSA at his son’s school responded with a proposal to form an “ex-gay” club—promoting the view that homosexuals can change their sexual orientation. Eventually, the student government itself voted down the idea of forming a GSA.62

Another approach has been to bar the formation of all clubs not related to the curriculum. The school district in White County, Georgia adopted this approach. Meanwhile, both houses of the Georgia legislature passed bills early in 2006 that would require parental permission for participation in any school club.63 This could effectively deter many students from participating, or at least insure that their parents are aware of this activity. A student who founded and heads a GSA in one Georgia high school said, “[I]f [my mom] knew I was running this club, she would take me out.”64

When a Texas school district was sued for preventing an off-campus “gay” youth group from meeting at Lubbock High School, the school successfully invoked certain exceptions to the Equal Access Act. The group’s plan to discuss “safe sex” was deemed “interference” with the district’s “abstinence-only” sex education curriculum. On its website were links to other sites that a federal judge declared “1) lewd, 2) indecent, and 3) obscene,” and therefore “detrimental to the physical, mental, and emotional well-being” of students.65

Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays and Gays (PFOX) has prepared a useful, ten-step guide on “How to Respond to a Gay-Straight Alliance (GSA) Club at your school,” which is available on their website at www.pfox.org.
Defining “Discrimination”

In the Westminster School District in Orange County, California, trustees balked at adopting a policy “that gives boys who consider themselves girls and girls who regard themselves as boys the right to pursue discrimination complaints.” In response, a state official threatened to withhold state aid that constitutes a significant part of the district’s budget. In the end, the board adopted its own definition of “gender” which the state grudgingly conceded “technically complies with state law”—but clarifies that the “perception of the alleged victim is not relevant to the determination of gender.”

Case Studies

Boyd County, Kentucky

Those challenging the pro-homosexual agenda in schools, however, should be prepared for a long battle. The experience of several communities across the country makes that clear.

For example, in Boyd County, Kentucky, teachers, parents, and students have been battling the formation of a Gay-Straight Alliance since at least 2002. When threats from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) resulted in approval of a GSA at Boyd County High School, nearly half of the school’s students boycotted classes in protest. When the school board attempted to ban all non-curricular clubs, the ACLU went to court, and in February 2004, the board agreed to allow the GSA to meet, and to hold “anti-harassment workshops” for both staff and students. The people of Boyd County again voted with their feet, with about a third of students not showing up for the training. In February 2006, a federal judge rejected the idea that parents should be allowed to opt their children out of the sessions.

However, the ACLU’s victories in court to this point may be hollow ones. By the time they settled their original case in February 2004, attendance at the GSA had dwindled from 19 at its first meeting in November 2002 to just three to five biweekly; by the following November, the group had disbanded altogether and its faculty adviser had transferred to another school.

San Leandro, California

San Leandro, California is another community that has seen years of contention and dueling lawsuits. In 1997, parents sued San Leandro High School English teacher Karl Debro for promoting a “gay agenda” in class. The lawsuit failed, but district officials reprimanded Debro and limited classroom discussion of “controversial issues.” Debro responded in 1999 with a lawsuit of his own—and in August 2002 received a settlement from the school district of over $1 million. The settlement, however, went beyond protecting Debro’s “freedom of speech.” It also required the school board to “hold staff and student training on diversity and non-discrimination”—thus imposing a “gay agenda” on the San Leandro schools, just as Debro had been accused of doing five years earlier.
In January 2006, teachers at San Leandro High School were forced (some against their will) to post posters declaring their classrooms a “safe space” for homosexual youth. But no posters declare that the classrooms are a “safe space” for students who are overweight or dress differently, nor for Black, Latino, freshman, disabled, Arab and Asian students—even though a 2002 survey at the school had found that they, too, are often victims of “harassment.”

“I’ll See You in Court”

Unfortunately, going to court may sometimes be the only option for parents or students who object to—or even want to respond to—pro-homosexual activism in the schools.

There may be a number of other grounds on which schools could be held legally liable for damages for teaching about homosexuality to children. In addition to parental rights issues, they include:

- Endangering the physical health of a child
- Endangering the mental health of a child
- Contributing to the delinquency of a child
- Unconstitutional restraint of First Amendment rights through restrictive student speech or anti-harassment codes.

More information is available in a publication available from Citizens for Community Values (CCV) of Cincinnati, Ohio entitled *The Legal Liability Associated with Homosexuality Education in Public Schools.*

The Christian student excluded from a “Diversity Week” panel on “Religion and Homosexuality” in an Ann Arbor, Michigan high school won an award of $102,738 in legal fees from a federal judge who lamented “the ironic, and unfortunate, paradox of a public high school celebrating ‘diversity’ by refusing to permit the presentation to students of an ‘unwelcomed’ viewpoint on the topic of homosexuality and religion, while actively promoting the competing view.”

Parents have successfully sued regarding pro-homosexual curriculum changes as well. In Montgomery County, Maryland, the Board of Education adopted a revised sex education curriculum in November 2004 that included for the first time a detailed—and highly slanted—discussion of sexual orientation. When the Board of Education ignored citizen protests, PFOX and the local Citizens for a Responsible Curriculum (CRC) went to court and won a Temporary Restraining Order to block the curriculum’s implementation. The judge found that it violated the Constitution’s ban on the “establishment of religion” by, for example, juxtaposing the portrait “of an intolerant and Biblically misguided Baptist Church against other, preferred Churches.” He also found that it violated freedom of speech by presenting only the view “that homosexuality is a natural and morally correct lifestyle.”

Parents have successfully sued regarding pro-homosexual curriculum changes as well. In Montgomery County, Maryland, the Board of Education adopted a revised sex education curriculum in November 2004 that included for the first time a detailed—and highly slanted—discussion of sexual orientation. When the Board of Education ignored citizen protests, PFOX and the local Citizens for a Responsible Curriculum (CRC) went to court and won a Temporary Restraining Order to block the curriculum’s implementation. The judge found that it violated the Constitution’s ban on the “establishment of religion” by, for example, juxtaposing the portrait “of an intolerant and Biblically misguided Baptist Church against other, preferred Churches.” He also found that it violated freedom of speech by presenting only the view “that homosexuality is a natural and morally correct lifestyle.”
Conclusion

Kevin Jennings, Executive Director of GLSEN, has suggested that criticism of the homosexual agenda in schools rests on “the myth that homosexuals recruit children.”

But in at least one sense, pro-homosexual activists in our schools do indeed “recruit children.” What they seek to do is “recruit children”—100% of our children, “gay” or straight—as soldiers in their war against truth, common sense, and traditional moral values. That’s one recruitment drive that has no place on the campuses of America’s public schools.
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Advocates for same-sex marriage reject the definition of marriage as the union of a man and a woman. This pamphlet shows how homosexual marriage is not the equivalent of traditional marriage and demonstrates that “gay marriage” is not a civil rights issue or a matter of “discrimination.”

**Suggested Donation: $1.50**

**Getting It Straight: What the Research Shows About Homosexuality**  **BK04A01**
For decades, the public has not been “getting it straight” from the news media, entertainment media, and academia. Using direct quotations from scholarly articles and publications, Getting It Straight is a compilation of research findings which debunk the many widely-promoted myths concerning homosexuality.

**Suggested Donation: $5.00**

**Washington Update**  **WUSUB**
Family Research Council’s flagship subscription: a daily email update with the latest pro-family take on Washington’s hottest issues.

**Subscribe FREE today!**
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